

For EPA Internal Use ONLY

**ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
INFORMATION NEEDED TO DETERMINE SITE ELIGIBILITY (updated 4/11)**

(Use Tab, arrow keys or mouse to move through questions; use Spacebar or mouse to check boxes)

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Date: July 2, 2015

1. Grant number: BF96166601
2. Grant recipient: City of Chicopee, MA
3. Person providing site information: Lee M. Pouliot
4. Property/site name: Former Savage Arms Property
5. Property address: 0 Main Street Chicopee, MA 01020 (Assessor Map 174, Parcel 18)
6. Current property owner: William J. Stetson et. ux.
7. Work to be done: ☐ Phase I ☒ Phase II ☐ Phase III ☐ Other
Explain Other: Supplemental Phase II Assessment

B. SITES ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

1. Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfields (*a real property, the expansion, redevelopment or reuse of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants*)? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Type of contamination present: ☐ Hazardous Substances ☐ Petroleum ☒ Co-Mingled
(*If the site has both hazardous substances and incidental petroleum contamination, check the box the "co-mingled" box. If the site has hazardous substances and distinguishable petroleum contamination, you must obtain approval from the State and EPA.*)
3. Describe the operational history and current use(s) of the site: The former Savage Arms property has a long history of industrial use that stretches to the late 1800's. Around 1885, the Site was operated as the B. and J. Belcher Agricultural Works which operated a foundry, storage house, grinding room and coal shed. Between 1885 and 1891, Taylor and Gale Agricultural Works took ownership of the property. Circa 1896, A.D. Spaulding & Brothers owned the property and utilized the buildings for the manufacturing of bicycles.

In 1902, the Lamb Knitting Machine Company operated the buildings on site. By 1910, automobiles

were manufactured on the western portion of the Site by the Stevens-Duryea Automobile Company. In 1915, the New England Westinghouse Company manufactured rifles on a portion of the Site. J. Stevens Arms, a division of Savage Arms Corporation obtained ownership of all buildings by approximately 1950. The Site was converted from a factory to lofts prior to 1967, when James G. Cayon took ownership of the property. A fire in 1967 destroyed the majority of buildings. Chico Realty Trust obtained ownership of the property in 1961 and William J. Stetson et. ux. obtained ownership in 2015. Since the fire, the property has remained substantially vacant - it was reported that the fire-damaged structures were demolished into existing foundations and covered with fill. The Site has been overgrown with vegetation likely since the demolition and filling was completed.

4. Describe the environmental concerns at the site, including when and how the site became contaminated and, to the extent possible, the nature and extent of the contamination. If the environmental concerns are unknown, or if the land has been vacant for many years, why do you think it is contaminated? : The City of Chicopee previously completed an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (March 8, 2011) and a Limited Subsurface Investigation (October 19, 2011) on this site as it sits adjacent to the RiverMills at Chicopee Falls Brownfields redevelopment project. The Phase I indicated a number of recognized environmental conditions (RECs) including potential underground storage tanks (USTs) and lead / asbestos-containing building materials buried in demolition debris following the 1961 fire that destroyed site buildings. The Limited Subsurface Investigation was advanced upon recommendations from the Phase I Assessment and included the advancement of two soil borings and the installation/sampling of thirteen (13) test pits. Additional investigations were recommended to identify and assess numerous underground conduits (i.e. penstocks), fill materials, demolition debris and the former canal.
5. Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property: The Savage Arms property is located adjacent to the RiverMills at Chicopee Falls Brownfields redevelopment project and was initially studied for redevelopment as part of the RiverMills visioning process. During that process, a vision of re-establishing the downtown nature of this property with mixed-use infill buildings and housing was a priority. The current property owner is considering the development of a multi-purpose sports complex on the property that work enhance the planned redevelopment visions for RiverMills.

C. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your facility listed (or proposed for listing) on the National Priorities List? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Is your facility subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA? ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Is your facility subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control the US government? (Land held in trust by the US government for an Indian tribe is eligible.) ☐ Yes ☒ No

*Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (C. 1-3) your property is **not** eligible.*

D. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING WITHOUT A PROPERTY SPECIFIC DETERMINATION:

Certain properties cannot be approved without a "Property Specific Determination". Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your site/facility subject to a planned or ongoing CERCLA removal action? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Has your site/facility been issued a permit by the U.S. or an authorized state under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (SWDA)? ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Is your site/facility subject to corrective action orders under RCRA (sections 3004(u) or 3008(h))? ☐ Yes ☒ No
4. Is your site/facility a land disposal unit that has submitted a RCRA closure notification under subtitle C of RCRA or is subject to closure requirements specified in a closure plan or permit? ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Has your site/facility had a release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that is subject to remediation under TSCA? ☐ Yes ☒ No
6. Has your site/facility received funding for remediation from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (D. 1-6), please call your Project Officer and she/he will explain how to prepare a property specific determination. Refer to Appendix 2, Section 2.5, of the Proposal Guidelines for additional information.

**** For petroleum sites, please proceed to Section F – Petroleum Only Sites**

E. PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

1. Are there any known ongoing or anticipated environmental enforcement actions (at the federal, state or local level) regarding the responsibility of any party for contamination or hazardous substances at the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, please explain:

Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment

grant recipient does NOT own the site:

1. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Describe the assessment grant recipient's relationship with the current owner and the owner's role in the work to be completed: The Grant recipient, the City of Chicopee, has a well-established working relationship with the current property owner who owns two businesses elsewhere in the City and has been active with the City's efforts to revitalize the West End - through the Brownfields Area-wide Plan for the neighborhood. An access agreement between the City of Chicopee and property owner will be executed prior to any Phase II assessment being completed.

Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient owns the site or will own the site during the grant performance period:

1. How was the property acquired (or how will it be acquired)?
 - a. ☐ Negotiated purchase from a private individual
 - b. ☐ Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit
 - c. ☐ Tax foreclosure
 - d. ☐ Eminent domain
 - e. ☐ Donation
 - f. ☒ Other (explain): N/A; City will not own or retain ownership of the Site.
2. What was the date when the property was acquired (or the anticipated date when it will be acquired)? The property was acquired by the current owner in the early 2015.
3. What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired? The property was acquired by William J. Stetson et. ux. from Orwat Henry J. & Edwin R. Orwat Trustees of Chico Realty Trust.
4. Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the assessment grant recipient has or has had with all prior owners or operators of the property: As a municipality, the grant recipient has collected property taxes from the current and prior owners. The Current owner also participated in an EPA funded Brownfields Area-wide Planning Grant awarded to the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission to study the West End neighborhood of downtown Chicopee.
5. Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the assessment grant recipient acquired (or will acquire) the property? ☒ Yes ☐ No
6. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

7. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No
8. Did the assessment grant recipient perform any environmental inquiry prior to the purchase of the property? ☒ Yes ☐ No
9. If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and indicate whether the applicant performed the pre-purchase inquiry in accordance with EPA's All Appropriate Inquiry rule (or ASTM E1527-05, or its equivalent at the time of purchase): The City completed an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment on March 8, 2011 through its LSP, BETA Group Inc. Limited Subsurface Investigations were completed by the City on October 19, 2011, also through BETA Group, Inc.

F. PETROLEUM ONLY SITES - PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Petroleum-only sites are to be submitted to the state for eligibility determination. Please contact your state representative to obtain the information they require to determine site eligibility. As a courtesy, send a copy of the site eligibility information to your EPA Project Officer so he or she is aware of potential upcoming work. The assessment grant recipient must provide their EPA Project Officer with a copy of the state's determination letter. The following questions are typical of the petroleum site information you may need to provide to the state:

1. Did the current and/or immediate past owner dispense or dispose of petroleum or petroleum products, or exacerbate existing petroleum contamination on the site? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Note: If the answers to question F.1 is no, the site may be eligible.*
2. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, did the responsible party take reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination on site? ☐ Yes ☐ No Explain:
3. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, is the responsible party financially capable to assess and clean up the site? ☐ Yes ☐ No Explain:

*Note: If question F.1 identified a responsible party who is liable for petroleum contamination at the site, and that party is financially viable to pay for assessment and cleanup costs, then the site is **not** eligible. If the identified responsible party took reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination at the site, and/or is not financially viable to pay for the assessment and cleanup costs, then the site may still be eligible.*

4. Is the site "relatively low risk" compared with other "petroleum-only" sites in the state:

a. Is the site currently being cleaned up using LUST trust fund monies? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Is the site currently subject to a response under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Note: If the answers to questions F.4a and F.4b are no, the site would be considered to be of relatively low risk for purposes of determining eligibility.

5. Has any responsible party been identified for the site through, either:

a. A judgment rendered in a court of law or an administrative order that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site: ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. An enforcement action by federal or state authorities against any party that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site: ☐ Yes ☐ No

c. A citizen suit, contribution action or other third party claim brought against the current or immediate past owner, that would, if successful, require the assessment, investigation, or cleanup of the site: ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act?
☐ Yes ☐ No

*Note: If the answer to any of the questions in F.5 or F.6 is yes, the site is **not** eligible.*

G. ACCESS

Does the assessment grant recipient have access or an access agreement for this property?

☒ Yes ☐ No

H. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA) COMPLIANCE

Note: If you answer yes to any of the following questions you should contact your project officer to determine if any additional information is required.

1. Is your selected property (site) currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places and/or is it a designated National Landmark? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. Is your selected property (site) eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places? ☐ Yes ☒ No

In order to support your response, please provide any and all documentation from the federal Government and/or State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). (i.e., SHPO Determination Letter which you may obtain independent of the EPA process.

3. Is your selected property (site) part of a designated Historic District? ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Will your project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures? ☐ Yes ☒ No

5. Does your project have the potential to impact archaeological resources? ☐ Yes ☒ No

I. SITE ELIGIBILITY

(To be filled out by EPA Project Officer.)

The site, at the above-described property, is eligible for assessment work: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Christie Lombard

Project Officer

7/8/2015

Date

Need for Attorney Consultation: ☐ Yes ☒ No Notes:

Additional Information:

